



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Resumptive pronouns and active dependency formation

Citation for published version:

Çokal, D & Sturt, P 2017, 'Resumptive pronouns and active dependency formation', CUNY Sentence Processing Conference, Boston, United States, 31/03/17. <<https://osf.io/hvstdg/>>

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



BACKGROUND

Resumptive pronouns (RPs) are overt pronouns where a gap would normally be expected:

(1) **Example with a RP:** Jane liked the magazine that the hairdresser had talked about it before going to the salon.

(2) **Example with a gap:** Jane liked the magazine that the hairdresser had talked about before going to the salon.

➤ RPs are ungrammatical in English.

➤ It has been suggested RPs can facilitate sentence comprehension (Beltrama, & Xiang, 2016).

➤ RPs are acceptable under certain conditions (Hofmeister & Norcliffe, 2013).

(e.g., When RPs appear in contexts where a gap would cause an island violation [Beltrama, & Xiang, 2016]).

➤ Most studies have focused on how RPs affect global acceptability. Here we report: (a) how RPs are processed during incremental comprehension, and (b) how this relates to reading skill.

➤ **Active dependency formation:** Filler-gap dependencies are formed actively (Frazier, 1987).

➤ However, active dependency formation is sensitive to islands and thus such a filled gap effect is ineffective in sentences with islands (Stowe, 1986; Traxler & Pickering, 1996)

Our predictions:

➤ Relying on active dependency formation, **we predict:**

(1) If filler-gap dependencies are formed actively, then processing difficulty should be observed in [1] at or around the RP (it), due to the disconfirmed prediction of a gap in this position.

(2) If active dependency formation is sensitive to islands, such a filled gap effect should not be observed in [2], where it appears inside a strong (relative clause) island.

Experiment 1

Method

➤ ($n=40$) Native English-speaking volunteers: 40 items, eye-tracking during reading, Eyelink 1000K (SR Research Ltd), (non-island vs. island) (pronoun vs. gap)

Conditions

[1] **RPs in the non-island condition.**

(e.g.) Jane liked the magazine that the hairdresser had talked/ about **it**/ before/ going to/ the salon.

[2] **RPs in the island condition.**

(e.g.) Jane liked the magazine that the hairdresser [_{RC} who had talked/ about **it**/ before/going to/ the salon] bought.

[3] **A gap in the non-island condition.**

(e.g.) Jane liked the magazine that the hairdresser had talked/ about/ before/ going to/ the salon.

[4] **A gap in the island condition.**


(e.g.) Jane liked the magazine that the hairdresser [_{RC} who had talked/ about/ before/ going to/ the salon] bought.

Results


As predicted, LMER analyses of multiple eye-movement measures in regions at or following the pronoun/gap-site revealed:

➤ active dependency formation lead to interaction in the non-island context and processing difficulties in [1] relative to a gap in [3] due to the filled gap effect.


➤ However, this contrast is not seen in the island context.




LMER analysis: total pass reading times: $t = 4.529$



LMER analysis: second pass reading times: $t = 2.913$



LMER analysis: second pass reading times: $t = 5.693$



LMER analysis: first-pass regressions out: $Z = 3.629$

Experiment 2

Method

➤ The method was identical to that used in Experiment 1.

Conditions:


1/2- RP or a gap in that complement condition (corresponding to non-island in Exp 1)

➤ This is the magazine that Jane said **that** the hairdresser had talked/ about (it)/ before/ going to/ the salon.


3/4- RPs or a gap in the weak island condition.

➤ This is the magazine that Jane wondered **whether** the hairdresser had talked/ about (it)/ before/ going to/ the salon.


Results



LMER analysis: regression path times: $t = 2.473$



LMER analysis: regression path times: $t = 2.502$




LMER analysis: regression path times: $t = 2.455$


OVERALL RESULTS FROM EYE-TRACKING EXPERIMENT

➤ RPs are subject to well-known processing biases relating to active dependency formation and island sensitivity.

INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN EXPERIMENTS 1 & 2



LMER participants with high scores: $t = 5.047$; low scores: $t = 2.747$



LMER participants with high scores: $t = -2.275$; low scores: $t = -1.819$

➤ Nelson Denny Test was used.

➤ (1) The magnitude of the observed two-way interaction in each experiment was greater for high-skilled readers than for low-skilled readers

➤ (2) This indicates that active dependency formation and/or island sensitivity is subject to individual differences in skill.